

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 2-4, 6, 7, 13, and 16 have been amended. Thus, claims 2-4, 6-16 and 19 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

At the top of page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner kindly indicated that it appears as though allowable subject matter is found in generic claims 4 and 7 (the only independent claims). As such, the Examiner withdrew the requirement for election of species. For this reason, the above listing of claims does not include status identifiers indicating “Withdrawn.”

Next, also on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 2-4, 6-16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In this regard, it appears that the Examiner’s concern relates to an inconsistent use of the terms “revolving speed” and “relative speed.” Accordingly, in order to overcome this rejection, the claims have been amended to change “relative speed” and “revolving speed” to both state --relative revolving speed--. Revisions have also been made to paragraphs [0014] and [0015] so as to clarify use of this term and make it clear that both terms refer to the same “relative revolving speed.” As such, it is submitted that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, has been overcome.

Next, at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2-4, 6-16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner kindly pointed out three instances of claim language considered to be indefinite.

First, the Examiner questioned “what controls application of current to the coil,” and noted in particular, lines 7-9 of claim 4 and lines 9-12 of claim 7. Accordingly, for consistency and to render the claim language definite, claim 7 has been amended to specify that the rotation transmission device includes “a variable setting unit for variably applying current to said electromagnetic coil,” and the previous recitation of “wherein when said roller clutch unit engages, electric power is applied to said electromagnetic coil ...” to --wherein when said roller clutch unit engages, said variable setting unit applies electric to said electromagnet coil ...--, so that the claim language of claims 4 and 7 is now consistent in reciting that it is the variable setting unit that applies current to the electromagnetic coil.

Next, the Examiner noted that the term “the member” at line 14 of claim 6 is unclear. Accordingly, the term “the member” at line 14 of claim 6 has been changed to --the one of the inner member and the outer ring-- along the lines of the Examiner’s suggestion. Note that this recitation finds antecedent at lines 3 and 4 of claim 6

Finally, regarding claim 13, line 3, the term “input member” has been changed to --inner member--, which finds proper antecedent basis in claims 6-8.

In view of these revisions, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has clearly been overcome.

Thus, for the reasons presented above amendments, as well as the Examiner’s kind indication of the independent claims 4 and 7, it is submitted that the application is now clearly in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koichi OKADA et al.

/Charles R Watts/

By: 2009.07.16 14:47:20 -04'00'

Charles R. Watts

Registration No. 33,142

Attorney for Applicants

CRW/asd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 16, 2009